new claims 27-35 because they are fully supported by the text of the application as filed (e.g., FIGS. 14-15; and the corresponding description on pages 12-13). covering the embodiments of Figures 14 and 15, wherein the bottle is fillable from the bottom.

In paragraph 5 of the office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 15-25 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,016,929. Applicant has overcome this rejection by filing herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) stating that U.S. Patent No. 6,016,929 is commonly owned with this application.

In paragraph 7 of the office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 15-20 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cautereels in view of Sanz et al. Cantereels discloses a baby bottle that relies on an adaptor to hold the teat in the neck of the bottle. The teat does not form an integral unit with the closure, otherwise the adaptor would not be needed. In Sanz the closure and teat of are clearly of the same material, which material must necessarily be relatively soft and flexible, otherwise the teat will not be usable. The relative softness and flexibility of the teat and closure of Sanz will render the combination or at least part thereof to be easily removable for the bottle to be re-filled and re-used.

Additionally, in Sanz, the teat is also removable from the closure because of the rupture line 15, whereby the teat part can be removed. This renders the bottle to an extent re-usable and with the removal of the teat part there will be access to allow the bottle and the remainder of the closure to be deformed for the remainder of the closure to be removed, which will again allow re-use. That is contrary to the aims of the present invention, in which removal of the closure and teat for re-use is to be prevented. That prevention is achieved by bonding the teat of soft flexible material to a more rigid closure material to form an integral unit.

Accordingly, the teachings of Cautereels either alone or in combination with Sanz et al. neither disclose nor suggest applicants' bonding the teat of soft flexible material to a more rigid closure material to form an integral unit as recited in the claims. Therefore, the rejection under Section 103(a) should be withdrawn. This aspect of the invention is also claimed in new claim 26.

In paragraph 8 of the office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 15-22, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ritsi in view of Sanz et al. Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of such references neither discloses, nor suggests, applicant's preferred embodiments as illustrated by the independent claims. Ritsi does not teach any method or configuration for avoiding re-use, nor does it teach the use of a teat and closure which are formed as an integral unit. Additionally, there is no teaching or suggestion to apply the closure mechanism of Sanz et al. to the bottle disclosed by Ritsi.

Further, the Examiner has not pointed out where in either of the cited patents the use of a teat and closure which are formed as an integral unit is disclosed. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness because the combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims. See In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974); MPEP 2143.03. For these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims are nonobvious and allowable. Hence, the dependent claims must also be nonobvious because they depend from nonobvious base claims. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under Section 103 should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks overcome the basis of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Prompt and favorable

reconsideration is respectfully requested. The examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned via telephone to resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Robert G. Lancaster
Registration No. 43,736
BRYAN CAVE LLP
One Metropolitan Square
211 North Broadway, Suite 3600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2750
Tele. (314) 259-2207
Facs. (314) 259-2020